

REMARKS

1. Applicant has amended the specification at page 2 to provide definitions of XFP (10 gigabit small form factor pluggable module) and EMI (electro-magnetic interference). VCSEL (vertical cavity surface emitting lasers) was defined in the original specification at page 1, line 18.

2. Applicant has attached hereto a copy of drawing Fig. 40 of the XFP MSA. The XFP MSA is the standard set by multi-source agreement for the industry for the XFP module. The specifications defined therein must be complied with by manufacturers of XFP modules.

3. Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected as anticipated by Jones. Claims 1 and 5-7 stand rejected as anticipated by Hwang. Applicant traverses.

One of the key elements of the present invention is the integral intermediate rear EMI gasket formed by the protruding fingers on the body of the transceiver cage. Those fingers protrude upward so as to shield the interior of the cage body. The intermediate rear EMI gasket is called out in the XFP MSA, and is therefore a requirement of construction of the module.

The XFP MSA describes the intermediate rear EMI gasket as an independent element. However, due to the unique construction afforded by the present invention, the intermediate rear EMI gasket can be formed as an integral element of the transceiver cage body. This eliminates an assembly process, thereby reducing cost and time required for the assembly process.

Integrating the intermediate rear EMI gasket into the transceiver cage body is not obvious on at least two counts. First, the XFP MSA describes the element as an

independent piece. Therefore the accepted standard practice is to manufacture it as such. Second, when the transceiver is inserted into the transceiver cage body, the intermediate rear EMI gasket has to be deflected to allow the insertion. Because the element forming the EMI gasket must be sufficiently thick to provide adequate protection, a significant force is applied to the connection point between the cage and the mounting board. If the intermediate rear EMI gasket is formed integral to the transceiver cage body in current art devices, the cage is dislodged from the host board. Only with the unique leg structure of the present invention can the cage withstand the force generated by the deflection of the intermediate rear EMI gasket fingers as the transceiver is inserted.

Neither Jones or Hwang discloses any element that could be considered as an equivalent of the intermediate rear EMI gasket. In order to serve such a function, the element would have to project upward from the lower surface into the interior of the transceiver cage. See Fig. 4, element 18 of the present invention. Neither Jones or Hwang appears to have any element that could meet this requirement. In order to anticipate or to render obvious claims, the prior art must disclose or indicate all the elements of the claims. In this instance, there is no reference in the cited prior art that teaches an integral rear intermediate EMI gasket as is claimed in present claim 1. All other present claims depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1. Accordingly, the prior art cannot be said to anticipate or to render obvious the present claims.

4. Claims 2 and 4 stand rejected as obvious over Jones. Applicant traverses.

As discussed above, there is no disclosure in Jones of an integral EMI shield. As such, the thickness of same cannot be surmised. Moreover, as also discussed above, prior art constructions could not support fingers of the thickness described in claims 2 and

4, due to the inability of the connector pins to anchor the transceiver cage in the host board. In order to render obvious claims, the prior art must disclose or indicate all the elements of the claims. In this instance, there is no reference in the cited prior art that teaches the use of an integral rear intermediate EMI shield as is claimed in the present claims. Accordingly, the prior art cannot be said to render obvious the present claims.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant now asserts that all of the grounds for rejection have been traversed or overcome by amendment, and that all of the present claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration of the objections and rejections, and solicits allowance of the present claims at an early date.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 16, 2004

Registration No: 32,737
Telephone: (408) 778-3440



Keith Kline
THE KLINE LAW FIRM, P.C.
14910 Bonner Court
Morgan Hill, CA 95037-5925